

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5 have been canceled. Applicant submits new claims 8-10. Claims 3-4 and 6-10 are now pending in the application. Applicant amends claims 3 and 7 for further clarification, and submit claims 8-10—which incorporate features that correspond to those of claims 1, 2, and 5, respectively—to round out the scope of the invention. No new matter has been added.

Applicant, again, acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claim 6.

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,535,562 to Mohseni et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,504,775 to Chouly et al.; and claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohseni et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,173 to Yanagi, and Chouly et al. Applicant amends claims 3 and 7 in a good faith effort to clarify the invention as distinguished from the cited references, and respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner relied upon Mohseni et al. as a new principal reference that allegedly discloses the main features of the claimed invention, and, again, relied upon Chouly et al. as a combining reference specifically for its alleged suggestion of “reverse operations.”

In particular, the Examiner relied upon Figs. 12A-12B and their corresponding description in Mohseni et al. as alleged disclosure of the claimed amplitude control features. Such portions of Mohseni et al. only include, however, description of amplitude reduction for all signals, where phase rotation—as illustrated by Figs. 12B, 12C, and 13 of Mohseni et al.—preferably results in signals, with amplitude reduced, away from the I and Q axes.

As such, Mohseni et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner—and, correspondingly, the Examiner’s proposed combination of Mohseni et al. and Chouly et al.—fail to disclose or suggest the claimed features of increasing “the amplitude component of the received signal when the received signal is on the I axis or on the Q axis,” and not increasing

“the amplitude component of the received signal by the predetermined factor when the received signal is neither on the I axis nor on the Q axis.” (Emphasis added)

In other words, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Mohseni et al. and Chouly et al. at the time the claimed invention was made, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

“[a] digital baseband demodulation apparatus,
comprising:

a quadrature detection unit that detects an I component signal and a Q component signal with respect to a received signal;

an amplitude control unit that increases the amplitude component of the received signal by a predetermined factor when the received signal is on the I axis or on the Q axis, and that does not increase the amplitude component of the received signal by the predetermined factor when the received signal is neither on the I axis nor on the Q axis; and

a despread demodulation unit that complex despreads the I component signal and the Q component signal by using spreading code for I axis and spreading code for Q axis to obtain a complex despread signal,” as recited in claim 3. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3, together with claim 4 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Mohseni et al. and Chouly et al., separately or in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 8 and 10 incorporate features that correspond to those of claim 3 cited above, and are, therefore, together with claim 9 dependent from claim 8, patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner cited Yanagi as a further combining reference to specifically address additional features recited in claim 7, which also incorporates features that correspond to those of claim 3 cited above. As such, a further combination with Yanagi would still have failed to cure the above-described deficiencies of Mohseni et al. and Chouly et al., even assuming, arguendo, that such a further combination would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the claimed invention was made. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter T. Chang/

Dexter T. Chang

Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6384

Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987

Docket No.: FUJI 20.849 (100794-00533)

DTC:tb